

**1ST QUARTERLY PERSONAL PROPERTY PILOT
CONTRACTORS' MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, 24 MAY 1999**

Ft. Belvoir Community Center
Taylor Road
Ft. Belvoir, Virginia

1. Phyllis Broz opened the meeting with introductions and stated the purpose of the meeting:
 - a. Discuss the status of the pilot.
 - b. Discuss lessons learned to date.
 - c. Determine good ideas for the future.
 - d. Obtain your "sense of pilot".
2. Zalerie Moore, Contracting Officer, introduced her staff and stated that:
 - a. Renegotiation of the contract was not the purpose of the meeting.
 - b. Any modifications needed would most likely be bilateral so the contractors would have an opportunity to respond.
 - c. The COR's at the PPSO's are appointed by Zalerie and act on her behalf.
 - d. If the COR's instructions are inconsistent or in violation of the contract, the contractor should notify Zalerie's office.
3. Cullen Hutchinson presented a short briefing on the status of the pilot that included statistics on pilot shipments as of 5/18/99, customer survey stats, categories of poor performance comments and statistics on shipment volume by channel.
 - a. Question: Can we get shipment volume by channel published monthly on the Web?
Answer: MTMC will consider this.
 - b. Question: Can we get information quickly on performance areas where we need to take corrective action, i.e. drinking or racial tension.
Answer: MTMC agrees that it is important for the contractor to receive this information and will consider this request.
 - c. Question: Why aren't surveys done based on the information in PTOPS? We need performance data in the system so allocation of shipments will be based on our performance.
Answer: Audit related questions are conducted at the same time as customer survey questions, therefore, Parsifal needs to have the invoice prior to doing the survey.
 - d. Question: Is the allocation of traffic to large and small business running as expected?
Answer: MTMC has not done an analysis on this, but we will.
 - e. Question: Have there been any delays in payment caused by Parsifal.
Answer: There have been no delays. Parsifal has been operating under their parameter of 10 days to audit.
4. Ann Gibson and Dinah Locklear discussed the list of issues submitted by the Government and the Contractors (see Attachment A)
5. Phyllis Broz introduced Jim Whitmire, Chief, Atlanta RSMO, and explained that contractors should contact his office if the COR at the PPSO is unable to assist them. Jim also certifies the invoices from Parsifal prior to the invoices being sent to DFAS for payment.
6. During the meeting, time was allocated to the contractors to discuss issues one-on-one with the MTMC reengineering team personnel.
7. Report on sensing breakouts (see Attachment B)
8. Closing remarks (see Attachment C).

ATTACHMENT A

MTMC ISSUES BUSINESS RULES/PROCESS ISSUES

ITEM: 1

SUBJECT: Excess cost calculation and collection.

ISSUE: We recently discovered some confusion among contractors and PPSOs as to whom is responsible to calculate and collect excess costs from service members. The PPSO is still responsible to calculate and collect the proper excess costs from the service member.

MTMC

RECOMMENDATION: Contractors main involvement should be providing the origin PPSO the origin net weight as soon as the shipment is weighed so the PPSO may quickly advise the member of the final and actual excess costs.

ITEM: 2

SUBJECT: SIT origin and SIT destination.

ISSUE: Contractors should double check that they are placing shipments in storage in the correct location. The shipment offer screen indicates whether SIT should be at origin or at destination, and the shipment details also indicates whether SIT should be performed at origin or at destination.

MTMC

RECOMMENDATION: If a contractor is in doubt, they should ask the origin PPSO for clarification.

Questions/Comments:

Q. What about SIT saturation at destination?

A. In that case, the contractor should notify the PPSO so they can authorize SIT at origin. Affected PPSOs will continue to send situation reports during peak season advising when their locally available SIT capacity becomes saturated.

PTOPS/PROCESS ISSUES

ITEM: 3

SUBJECT: Incomplete contractor entered data in PTOPS.

ISSUE: Recently we have discovered a number of shipments in PTOPS with incomplete data. PTOPS indicates that the shipment was booked, and in some cases, that a premove survey was performed, but the information suddenly stops, and there is no way to determine if the shipment never picked up, or was picked up and delivered or stored somewhere. This lack of data defeats one of the primary purposes of a central database of information available to all pilot participants, that any and all interested parties can immediately ascertain the status, the

contractor, all pertinent shipment information, and the location or disposition of any given shipment. Destination PPSOs must know when a shipment is inbound to them so they may plan inspections. They must know where, and particularly when, a shipment is stored to ensure that service members do not exceed their entitlements and incur personal costs. Additionally, we are closely tracking various shipment related statistics and shipment costs. If contractors do not enter data as required by the PWS, we risk the success of the program. Contractors will receive contract violations for each failure to enter required data within the prescribed time limit. Unlike some of the other automatic system generated contract violations such as we have discussed such, as those for premove surveys and responses to shipment offers, we will look closely at these violations. Lastly, contractors will not be able to bill for these shipments when the BCCA contractor cannot find the verifications of services performed in PTOPS. The BCCA contractor will return the bill unprocessed.

MTMC

RECOMMENDATION: Enter data as required by the PWS.

Questions/Comments:

Q. Has MTMC spoken with the contractors about this problem?

A. Yes, when we know about it.

Q. If a shipment has been entered as “complete” and then the contractor needs to add something, will he be able to do that?

A. No, he will not and this problem has no easy fix. The contractor must go through the PPSO who will enter/correct the information if possible and required.

Q. How do we get notified about contract violations and are they accumulated by the PPSO?

A. Currently, there is no procedure in place to notify the contractor of his violations. Violations are collected by the PPSO and each PPSO can “see” all violations at the other PPSO’s. MTMC realizes that there is a problem with violations based on short notice shipments, however SRA pointed out that the PPSO has the ability to go into PTOPS and remove the violation. Also, MTMC may discount violations resulting from problems with the Internet. MTMC will look at developing a report to provide contractors with information on contract violations.

NOTE: The contractors emphasized that they need to know their violations in order to make corrections.

ITEM: 4

SUBJECT: Delivery of shipments to a location other than what was ordered by the PPSO.

ISSUE: We have observed several instances where contractors delivered shipments to a location other than what was ordered by the PPSO, based on a request from the service member. We appreciate the contractors' efforts to satisfy their customers; however, delivering a shipment to an alternate location may create problems for the contractor when they bill for the shipment. For example, recently a contractor delivered a shipment a short distance from the origin destination but in doing so, the destination region changed as did the applicable transportation rate and the responsible destination PPSO.

MTMC

RECOMMENDATION: We recommend contractors use caution when changing a delivery location especially if the change involves a new city and state. If in doubt you should contact the origin or destination PPSO.

Questions/Comments:

Q. What is safe for the contractor?

A. If the location is within the AOR, it is usually o.k. however it is best to check with the origin or destination PPSO.

BCCA ISSUES

ITEM: 5

SUBJECT: Length of time to submit invoices.

ISSUE: Currently, there are a large number of shipments that have been eligible for billing for 60 or more days. We are closely monitoring program costs, and the length of time to receive invoices delays our analysis efforts.

MTMC

RECOMMENDATION: We ask that contractors make every effort to present their invoices within 45 days of the date a shipment becomes eligible for billing.

Questions/Comments:

Q. Are we referring to "complete" invoices?

A. Yes; we are referring to "complete" invoices for shipments delivered to residence. At this time, we are not tracking the "partials" that have not been invoiced. The Military Services need the cost information consequently it is important for contractors to bill timely.

ITEM: 6

SUBJECT: Invoicing procedures.

ISSUE: Contractors are failing to comply with contract invoicing procedures. To assist in correcting the problems, we published invoicing instructions on the Web on 29 April 1999. Examples of such problems include, but are not limited to:

1. Missing/inappropriate weight tickets;
2. Warehouse receipts without warehousemen's signatures;
3. Members' original signatures missing on the Task orders;
4. Failure to provide three cost estimates for Other Direct Costs, i.e., air charges.

MTMC

RECOMMENDATION: Contractors are reminded to comply with the invoicing procedures as identified in the pilot contracts: FAR Clause 52.212-4(g)(Deviation) Invoice, and FAR Clause 52.212-4(i) Payment. These contract clauses detail the invoicing procedures and identifies application of the "Prompt Payment Act".

Questions/Comments:

Q. Why is Parsifal being so picky? Some contractors are waiting because they don't want a whole bunch of invoices to be rejected. Others may be chasing down the service member after the fact.

A. Parsifal is simply following the requirements in their PWS. The signature of the service member on the task order serves as the receiving report for the government.

Q. Parsifal is asking for other paperwork than signed task order and they wouldn't accept a statement provided by the contractor on the measurements taken by a government inspector on the distance for a long carry. Is there anything we can do?

A. Please provide specific information and MTMC will review for compliance.

Q. Do we come to MTMC if we don't agree with Parsifal?

A. No. Parsifal has "appeal" procedures, which you should follow first.

Q. Why would Parsifal ask us to send in documents by Federal Express?

A. Time is critical for you to correct a problem and eliminate the need for Parsifal to return your invoice; Parsifal must process the invoice within 10 days if they keep it or reject it within 7 days and provide a statement of difference.

Q. What about invoices rejected due to axle weight and what about constructive weight?

A. Axle weight is not acceptable (see item 4 of the Commercial Tariff, 400L, for further clarification). Questions on constructive weight should be submitted with specific information to MTMC.

ITEM: 7

SUBJECT: Late Payment Issue.

ISSUE: It has come to our attention that some contractors believe that their payments are being delayed by up to three months because of errors in the Central Contractor Registration (CCR). Although some problems with errors in the CCR still exist, DFAS-Indianapolis and the Coast Guard Finance Center have assured MTMC that these problems have not delayed processing of pilot invoices. DFAS took the initiative to contact the pilot contractors and the financial institutions to reconcile any discrepancies between the CCR/EFT information and the pilot contracts in order to avoid delays in payment.

MTMC

RECOMMENDATION: All pilot contractors were requested by the Contracting Officer by letter, dated April 7, 1999, to validate their banking information in the CCR.

CONTRACTOR ISSUES

BUSINESS RULE/PROCESS ISSUES

ITEM: 1

SUBJECT: Length of time to respond to shipment offers.

ISSUE: The two-hour response time to shipment offers is not sufficient.

CONTRACTOR

RECOMMENDATION: The two hours should be changed to eight working hours.

RESPONSE: We do not plan to change this requirement during the period of the pilot test. After completion of the pilot, we will take this recommendation into consideration when initiating a new solicitation.

Questions/Comments:

Q. How many shipments has this affected?

A. We don't have statistics, however we probably will not be giving much credence to these violations.

Q. Can a contractor provide comments in some way to counter the contract violations?

A. The contractor should put his comments in writing to the PPSO with a copy to MTMC. The PPSO has the ability to remove the violation. Also, the SRA help desk has a record of all systems outages if a contractor needs this information to remove a violation. In addition, each contractor received notice of the establishment of a new server to assist when there are connectivity problems (TSACS). Call Gail Richardson for further information, 681- 9114/7109.

Q. Since PPSO's don't monitor contract violations, shouldn't the contractors be able to do this?

A. Yes, but we are not in a position to make that possible right now.

Q. Should the PPSO be offering a shipment at 6:52 p.m. EST?

A. Please provide specifics on this shipment, as this should not happen.

ITEM: 2

SUBJECT: Length of time to provide required information.

ISSUE: The required one work day to provide information such as direct delivery, SIT placement, and SIT delivery, and origin pickup information not sufficient.

CONTRACTOR

RECOMMENDATION: The one workday should be changed to at least three, but not less than five working days. MTMC might also consider the impact on the service requirements if the data entry time frame was extended to as long as 30 days.

RESPONSE: The requirement for prompt entry of pickup and delivery information supports one of the major reasons we developed the PTOPS system. PTOPS makes shipment information available to all interested parties: the origin PPSO, the

destination PPSO, HQ MTMC, and others. PPSOs use PTOPS to quickly determine the status of a shipment, and decide if there may be a problem. PPSOs also use PTOPS to track SIT at origin and at destination, and ensure that service members do not exceed their entitlements. PPSOs also make use of shipment activity reports to plan on site inspections of pickups and deliveries. At HQ MTMC, we are using PTOPS to track shipment statistics of all types. Without prompt data input by contractors, we will lose the ability to fully utilize PTOPS.

Questions/Comments:

Q. What about a Saturday delivery?

A. You will not be penalized as PTOPS takes into account Saturdays, Sundays and Federal holidays and does not count those against you. Also, the server time is based on Eastern Standard Time.

ITEM: 3

SUBJECT: Shipment refusals.

ISSUE: Contractors receive a contract violation when they refuse a shipment under their CDC, even if the shipment is short notice.

CONTRACTOR

RECOMMENDATION: Contractors should not receive a contract violation for refusing a short notice shipment.

RESPONSE: PWS paragraph 12.1.1 prohibits the refusal of shipment offerings “until the CDC has been met or exceeded for a given day.” There are no special provisions for “short notice” shipments other than PWS paragraph 8.3. which states that ordering officers have the “option of verbally offering shipments with less than five (5) workdays notice.” Refusal of any shipments until the CDC has been met or exceeded will result in a contract violation, regardless of whether the shipment is short notice or not.

Questions/Comments:

Q. Why are there so many short notice shipments? Is it a problem with the counseling by the PPSO?

A. There will always be short notice shipments for various unavoidable reasons. We did look at the short notice shipments and found that over 90% were “true” short notice shipments. However, we are working with the PPSO’s to try to lessen the number as much as possible.

Q. Will the PPSO’s start putting odd social security numbers into the pilot when the current program gets saturated?

A. We do not expect to see any shuffling over from the current program, but MTMC may make exceptions and put an odd social security number shipment into the pilot. Also, MTMC is looking at the possible use of odd social security numbers in the pilot program in the future.

Q. Should we get a shipment with NTS in the pilot program?

A. Shipments coming out of NTS are not included in the pilot.

Q. What about a bluebark shipment where the HHG and auto went separately?

A. The shipments should have been offered together. Also, just a reminder that a bluebark involves a deceased service member or dependent so the contractor needs to be sensitive to that fact.

ITEM: 4

SUBJECT: Statistics to date of activity at each origin PPSO.

ISSUE: We have not received shipment offers from all origin PPSOs.

CONTRACTOR

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC provide the contractors the activity statistics for all origin PPSOs.

RESPONSE: We do not plan at this time to release shipment activity statistics. If a contractor has concerns about award of tonnage for a particular channel at an origin PPSO, the contractor should first contact the COR at that site. The COR should be able to address the contractor's concerns. If a discussion with the origin site COR is not sufficient, the contractor may then contact the ACO at the RSMO in Atlanta, or the PCO at HQ MTMC for resolution of the problem. Also, in some cases, not enough traffic has occurred to offer shipments to all contractors.

Questions/Comments:

Q. Once the round robin is over and the PPSO is looking at performance stats, will he also be looking at the contract violations which may or may not be valid.

A. The PPSO sees specific performance stats; such as on time pick-up and delivery, customer satisfaction, etc., on the offer screen but the contract violations are not on that screen. If all carriers are equal, the PPSO may want to check on the contract violations, but they will take into consideration what should be given credence and what should not.

Q. What about agents refusing shipments in the current program because of an "even" social security number.

A. Other criteria must be met for a shipment to go into the pilot so it is quite possible for an "even" social security number shipment to end up in the current program. The agent should be checking with the PPSO if he has any doubts.

Q. Are the PPSO's aware that the round robin is still in effect?

A. Yes, the PPSO's know that the round robin is still in effect; however, the minimums have been met so there is no requirement to do equal distribution.

Q. What about the two Marine Corps bases that say PTOPS is not reliable so they are not using it?

A. Please provide specifics so we can check on this.

ITEM: 5

SUBJECT: Problems encountered when contacting destination PPSOs.

ISSUE: Destination PPSOs most often only have one or two people who are authorized to approve verbal requests for additional services or enter data into the PTOPS

system. Sometimes there is no one at the PPSO who is adequately familiar with PTOPS to be able to assist the contractors. This causes delays when those persons are not available, and we must sometimes perform destination services and deliveries without proper approval in order not to inconvenience the service member, and consequently risk not being paid for the additional services we performed. Contractors have experienced delays of up to five days in getting ASANs and approvals for services performed.

CONTRACTOR

RECOMMENDATION: Provide additional training for destination PPSOs.

RESPONSE: We recognize there is a deficiency in destination training and we are looking into providing additional training. When we are notified a destination PPSO is confused about their role in the pilot program, we contact them immediately and help them get up to speed. We contacted the two PPSOs mentioned by one of our meeting participants, and they now understand their responsibilities under the pilot.

ITEM: 6

SUBJECT: Approvals for destination services performed on weekends or holidays.

ISSUE: Provide a procedure for obtaining approval of additional services when a delivery is performed on a weekend or holiday, and the destination PPSO is closed.

CONTRACTOR

RECOMMENDATION:

RESPONSE: When a contractor and service member have agreed to a delivery on a weekend or holiday, the contractor should determine the required additional services in advance, and contact the destination PPSO for approval.

Questions/Comments:

Q. In the PTOPS training sessions, it was recognized that this would be a problem especially in the summer months. What can we do?

A. Document any needs you can't get met before delivery.

ITEM: 7

SUBJECT: Spread dates.

ISSUE: Provide the status on contract modification P0003.

CONTRACTOR

RECOMMENDATION: Allow contractors to continue to negotiate spread dates with members.

RESPONSE: The original solicitation language regarding Attachment 4 spread dates will remain as written. A letter from the Contractor Officer confirming this information was faxed to all contractors on 20 May 99.

ITEM: 8

SUBJECT: Liability dollar amount.

ISSUE: Some PPSOs are incorrectly advising service members that their shipments are insured for \$63,000, rather than the correct liability coverage of \$3.50 times the net weight of the shipment, up to a maximum of \$63,000.

CONTRACTOR

RECOMMENDATION: Provide additional training for PPSOs.

RESPONSE: PPSOs have been furnished the proper information both in training and in the information mailed to them, (e.g., CD, PPSO/PPPO workbook, PTOPS Users Manuals). We have emphasized that the pilot includes full replacement protection of \$3.50 times the net shipment weight and the maximum claim is limited to \$63,000. However, we will include this issue in our next pilot program update message of this issue.

ITEM: 9

SUBJECT: Reweighs.

ISSUE: Contractors are required to get reweigh tickets within five days. What if the shipment does not deliver within five days of loading?

CONTRACTOR

RECOMMENDATION:

RESPONSE: There is no requirement to reweigh a shipment within five days of loading, or pickup. The five-day requirement in PWS paragraph 5.3.6 and 8.6 refers to the original weighing of the shipment at time of pickup. The five-day requirement stated in PWS paragraph 8.6.1 refers to furnishing the reweigh weight within five days of performing the reweigh, not within five days of the original pickup date.

ITEM: 10

SUBJECT: CDCs and shipment refusals.

ISSUE: Request a discussion of CDCs and shipment refusals.

CONTRACTOR

RECOMMENDATION:

RESPONSE: Contractors were required, based on PWS paragraphs 12.1.1 and 12.1.2, to submit a maximum tonnage they agree to commit daily for each traffic lane. The idea behind this requirement was to achieve a level of commitment from each contractor participating in the pilot. We are striving to maintain a long-term "committed" relationship with the contractors participating in the pilot. This issue was discussed at length during the 1996 summer meetings and we are adamant that this requirement remains as stated in the contract. Refusal was

also discussed at length during the summer meetings and the requirement is for contractors to accept shipments until the CDC has been met or exceeded for a given day. This requirement is for all shipments, even those shipments with less than 5 days notice.

Questions/Comments:

Q. How is the CDC factored into the distribution?

A. The CDC is considered during the round robin process.

ITEM: 11

SUBJECT: Shipment allocation method.

ISSUE: What method should PPSOs use to allocate shipments? Some PPSOs are allocating shipment based on lowest cost or quality ratings. They are not aware of MTMC guidance to continue the round robin shipment allocation method.

**CONTRACTOR
RECOMMENDATION:**

RESPONSE: Most PPSOs are continuing to offer shipments on a round robin basis because they have not received any performance data. However, some PPSOs have received performance information and are authorized to utilize that information for shipment offers. PPSOs may offer shipments based on the performance element that is most important to the customer or ordering officer, (e.g. Customer satisfaction, on-time pick up, on-time delivery, frequency if loss/damage, or loss/damage average).

Questions/Comments:

Q. Can the PPSO override the PTOPS selection?

A. Yes, they have that capability.

ITEM: 12

SUBJECT: Additional services included in origin and destination service fee.

ISSUE: MTMC guidance directs contractors to enter all services into PTOPS, even those included in the origin and destination service fees. However, some PPSOs state they only want to see services when they exceed those included in the service fees. Were PPSOs furnished different instructions than what was furnished to contractors?

CONTRACTOR

RECOMMENDATION: Provide clarification for PPSOs and contractors.

RESPONSE: Unfortunately, this issue had many pilot participants, both industry and PPSO's, confused. We provided guidance to PPSOs that all services (even those included in the origin/destination service fee) must be approved in order for contractors to enter the actual units performed. Contractors should continue obtaining approval and entering the total number of units performed into PTOPS. We will remind PPSOs in the next pilot program update message to ensure they approve those services that are included in the service fees.

Questions/Comments:

Comment from MTMC: We plan to remind PPSO's in our next advisory message about the need to approve additional services even if they are included in the origin/destination service fee.

Q. Why will PPSO's only approve servicing for two appliances?

A. The Military Appendix to the Tariff 400-L provides for the servicing at origin and reservicing at destination of up to two appliances (Item 173). These two appliances are included in the Origin/Destination Service Fee and that is why the PPSO's will only approve servicing for two appliances. The contractor may service any additional appliances that he feels need service for safe and secure transportation, however the charges for any additional appliances are included in the SFR for international shipments and the tariff transportation rate for domestic shipments. These additional appliances do not require approval by the PPSO since there will be no separate billing on them.

PTOPS/PROCESS ISSUES

ITEM: 13

SUBJECT: Cancelled orders.

ISSUE: Contractors are not notified of cancelled orders. A contractor does not know an order is cancelled until they attempt to update the task order information and receive an error message.

CONTRACTOR

RECOMMENDATION: Issue an advisory when orders are cancelled.

RESPONSE: PPSOs have made the assumption that, since the members are instructed to always contact their contractor with any changes, the contractor will know about shipment cancellation before the PPSO knows. Since that is not the case, we will advise PPSOs in our next pilot program update message to telephonically notify the contractor in the event a shipment is cancelled completely. We will add the suggestion of an electronic shipment cancellation notice to our list of future software enhancements.

ITEM: 14

SUBJECT: Automatic contract violations generated by PTOPS.

ISSUE: PTOPS automatically generates a contract violation when premove survey information is not entered three days prior to the pickup date. This occurs even when the shipment is offered to the contractor three days or less before the service member's requested pickup date, and the contractor cannot possibly meet the three-day requirement.

A contractor was advised by a PPSO that in order to have a violation of this type removed, the request must be in writing. This appears to be an unnecessary additional burden to the contractor to remove a violation that was not his fault. These problems, such as unwarranted contract violations, question the validity of any PTOPS generated reports that will assess contractor quality and contract compliance.

CONTRACTOR

RECOMMENDATION: None

RESPONSE:

We recognize that PTOPS generates an automatic contract violation under the circumstances outlined above. PPSOs can now cancel contract violations in PTOPS when warranted. Although we cannot address why a PPSO would ask for a violation cancellation request in writing, it may simply be that they are not as readily aware that violations have occurred that they need to correct. They may simply be depending on each contractor to notify them when a violation should be removed.

Questions/Comments:

Q. What if we are unable to contact the service member and the PPSO is not helpful?

A. MTMC will re-emphasize to the PPSO's to counsel the service member on the importance of his communication with the contractor. PPSO's can usually reach a service member through his unit.

ITEM:

15

SUBJECT:

Contractors cannot make corrections when they select the wrong task order to work on, or when data entry errors are made.

ISSUE:

When a contractor in error selects the wrong task order to work on, and has entered data into PTOPS, there is no way to correct the error without contacting a PPSO. Depending on the nature of the error, sometimes even the PPSO cannot make the corrections.

After a contractor has indicated a shipment has been picked up or delivered, there is no way to correct or add additional services we might have forgotten to input.

CONTRACTOR

RECOMMENDATION: Provide an Administrator Mode for contractors where they can easily correct data entry errors. Limit access to this function to the contract manager and alternate.

Until such time as contractors can make changes themselves, provide list of contacts at each PPSO who can make required corrections to data in a timely manner.

RESPONSE:

a. Each "set of information" the contractor is required to report to the government is represented as a menu option on the contractor main menu, e.g. Record Premove Survey Information, Record Pickup Information, Record Placement in SIT at Destination Information. In order to report the required

information to the government in accordance with the PWS, the user must select the correct menu option and the correct task order number. The user then enters all of the relevant information to report to the government for that task order number. Until the user “Confirms” that information using the “Confirm” option, the user can change any of the information he/she has entered. Not until the user confirms is the information considered “reported” to the government per the PWS. PTOPS has been designed such that if the contractor erroneously reports information to the government, the contractor can contact the government and ask that the details of that reported information be changed. It was designed this way intentionally, so that the contractor, without the government’s knowledge, would not change information after that information had been reported to the government. PTOPS has been modified to allow the contractor to change pickup and delivery dates scheduled during the Premove Survey. PTOPS can be modified to allow the contractor to change other already reported information, but the impacts on both the business rules and technical issues must be considered. For example, if the contractor were allowed to change the actual pickup weight reported to the government at the time of pickup, the shipping officers monitoring shipments for reweigh would have to check constantly for changing weights. Currently, the contractor must request the change by the shipping officer and the shipping officer (the designated PTA) uses the General Module Update Shipment option to update the weight.

- b. The way PTOPS is currently designed, once the contractor “confirms” the information he/she is reporting to the government, PTOPS updates the status of that shipment. When shipment status updates take place, PTOPS has been designed to perform some “behind the scenes” automated logic. Some of the things that are automatically performed for the user are:
 - (1) PTOPS automatically assigns a status code to the shipment to facilitate fast processing when any user needs to know information about shipments in a certain status.
 - (2) PTOPS automatically generates a task order number when the contractor accepts a shipment offer.
 - (3) Based on the type of status the shipment has reached, PTOPS automatically checks for applicable PWS violations and automatically generates them if specific business rules have been violated.
 - (4) Once the Premove Survey information is confirmed, PTOPS automatically takes a “snapshot” of the shipment data to be used for the task order form. Subsequently, whenever data that appears on the form changes and is confirmed, PTOPS takes a new “snapshot” and automatically generates a new task order form modification.
 - (5) For purposes of tracking excess cost, the system automatically sets flags if the shipment shows excess distance or excess weight. These flags are used to list all of the shipments in the Monitor Excess Cost function provided for the shipping officer, and these flags are used to indicate possible excess cost on the task order form.
 - (6) When the contractor records and confirms that a shipment has been placed in SIT at Destination, one function of the system is to automatically extract all of that shipment’s information to an ASCII file and sends it to the auditor system. This file will be used by the auditor system as an artifact to audit the submitted invoice.

When a contractor has “confirmed” the information he/she is reporting about a shipment, PTOPS is not currently designed to allow the user to “undo” that confirmation which would entail “undoing” all of the automatic “behind the

scenes” changes. PTOPS could be designed to perform these “undos”; the level of effort required would be extensive.

c. PTOPS is designed such that the contractor must report all additional service information when reporting the pickup or delivery. Once the contractor confirms that all information is complete, there is a way to correct or add to the additional service information. The capability is available to the shipping officer via the General Module Update Shipment Information option.

We do not plan to change this functionality during the period of the pilot test. After completion of the pilot, we will take this recommendation into consideration when initiating a new solicitation.

Questions/Comments:

Q. Can PTOPS provide some provision for contractors to enter comments?

A. Not at this point, but MTMC will consider this proposal. In the meantime, contractors need to be very careful to double check before “confirming” the information.

ITEM: 16

SUBJECT: Approving destination services at origin.

ISSUE: There are several services performed at origin, which always require a like service at destination. For example, articles that are approved for special crating at origin must be uncrated at destination; articles which required a third party to disassemble required a third party at destination to reassemble. Some origin PPSOs will approve the origin and destination services required, some will only approve the origin service. When the origin does not approve the destination service that we know in advance must be performed, the contractor must contact the destination PPSO for approval. This could cause delays in deliveries.

CONTRACTOR

RECOMMENDATION: Provide training for PPSOs so they will approve the destination and origin services when warranted. Design the PTOPS system so that the destination services remain only authorized, and do not become actual until the final residence delivery is accomplished so there is no payment liability issue.

RESPONSE: We agree either the origin or destination PPSO may approve these types of services. We would like to emphasize that contractors may not invoice for these services before they are performed. Therefore, if there is a shipment that required third party servicing and the shipment went into SIT at destination, the contractor may not bill for the destination portion until the shipment is delivered and the service is performed. We will advise origin PPSOs that they may approve these types of services in our next pilot program update message.

ITEM: 17

SUBJECT: Completion of premove surveys.

ISSUE: Some origin PPSOs do not approve additional services requested, as a result of premove surveys, in a timely manner. Contractors have had to pickup shipments without a task order for the service member to sign, and causing the contractor to enter pickup data late and receive a contract violation.

**CONTRACTOR
RECOMMENDATION:**

RESPONSE: PWS paragraph 5.1.5. states the origin ordering officer will issue a task order to the contractor confirming the services authorized within two workdays after receipt of the pre-move survey information from the contractor, but not later than one workday prior to pickup. However, we will reemphasize the PPSO's responsibility to approve or disapprove requested additional services in a timely manner in our next pilot program update message. If this problem continues to occur at specific sites, we will contact that PPSO individually and ensure they understand.

ITEM: 18

SUBJECT: Shipment offer details.

ISSUE: There is not enough detail in the information provided to contractors in the shipment offers.

**CONTRACTOR
RECOMMENDATION:** Provide additional details to the contractor in the shipment offers.

RESPONSE: The shipment offer details contains a sufficient amount of information for a contractor to decide if they can handle the shipment. The contractor can view the requested dates, the origin and destination, and the estimated shipment weights. The service member's personal information, such as name, rank, and social security number, is not provided in the initial offer process. When the contractor accepts the shipment, the additional details are available.

ITEM: 19

SUBJECT: PTOPS system speed.

ISSUE: There are times when the PTOPS system is very slow.

**CONTRACTOR
RECOMMENDATION:**

RESPONSE: The time to access the PTOPS system will be slow during high Internet and NIPRNET traffic times and when the gateway between the Internet and NIPRNET, the military unclassified public network, is having problems. PTOPS has no control over the network traffic load or network problems, but is in the process of creating alternatives for the contractors for accessing the NIPRNET when the gateway between the Internet and NIPRNET is not functioning properly. The contractors will be given a toll free telephone number to dial into the NIPRNET when PTOPS response time is extremely slow. Also, PTOPS is investigating moving the system to the Internet. This move will resolve gateway issues for the contractors but could present additional problems for the PPSOs.

Questions/Comments:

Q. After the contractor sends in the information requested for TSACS (Terminal Server Access Controller System), will he get additional information?

A. Yes, once the server is up and access codes are made available. Keep in mind that the new server is being established to handle a total outage situation, not to “fix” slowness.

ITEM: 20

SUBJECT: Notification of date changes.

ISSUE: Contractors are required to telephonically contact the origin PPSO to advise them of date changes.

CONTRACTOR

RECOMMENDATION: Allow contractors to provide date change information by e-mail

RESPONSE: PTOPS has recently been modified to allow the contractor to update scheduled pickup, scheduled delivery, and scheduled delivery from SIT dates without having to contact the PPSO. If actual dates require changing, SRA does not endorse the e-mail solution because the solution could prove quite inefficient. If the shipping officer receives changes to the actual pickup, actual storage, or actual delivery date changes via e-mail, he or she must record them in PTOPS using the General Module Update Shipment option. If the e-mailed date fails an edit check (e.g. the actual delivery from SIT date cannot be earlier than the placement in SIT date), the shipping officer would need to contact the contractor to resolve the issue.

Questions/Comments:

Q. Why will PTOPS not allow a change to the pack date?

A. SRA is in the process of correcting that.

ITEM: 21

SUBJECT: Ability to print a task order prior to shipment delivery.

ISSUE: Contractors cannot print out the task order containing the final delivery from SIT until the day of the delivery. PTOPS will not permit a delivery be indicated until on or after the delivery date.

CONTRACTOR

RECOMMENDATION: Provide contractors the ability to indicate delivery prior to the delivery date.

RESPONSE: This recommendation is in violation of the PWS paragraph 5.7 which requires the contractor to report delivery after the shipment has been delivered, not before. If the contractor needs to use the task order to take to delivery, the task order can be updated by hand and signed by the customer to indicate the delivery was performed.

ITEM: 22

SUBJECT: Additional PTOPS training for contractors.

ISSUE: Additional PTOPS training for contractors would be helpful.

CONTRACTOR

RECOMMENDATION: Training should include specifics on how to submit billing and on reporting formats.

RESPONSE: We do not have any plans at this time to conduct additional contractor training.

ITEM: 23

SUBJECT: Customer surveys.

ISSUE: Contractors want to see the results of customer surveys.

CONTRACTOR

RECOMMENDATION: Furnish customer survey information to contractors on at least a monthly basis.

RESPONSE: We have no plans to provide individual customer survey information to contractors on a monthly basis at this time. We could possibly provide a summary of performance information to contractors and would like to discuss this option in more detail during the meeting.

Questions/Comments:

Q. Since most contractors are doing their own surveys internally, would it be possible for MTMC to test the validity of the surveys by comparing contractor survey information to Parsifal Corporation information.

A. We are aware that contractors need to know specifics in order to make corrections, however we do not want to get into a “who is right” contest. We are however considering how best to report performance statistics to the individual contractors.

ITEM: 24

SUBJECT: Domestic unaccompanied baggage shipments with an authorized weight of zero.

ISSUE: A number of domestic unaccompanied baggage shipments had authorized weight entitlements of zero. These shipments were less than 500 pounds. The PTOPS systems generates an automatic order to perform a reweigh when the actual weight exceeds the authorized weight, so all of these shipments required reweighs. This is a waste of time and funds.

CONTRACTOR

RECOMMENDATION: Provide guidance to PPSOs to assign a weight entitlement for these shipments and avoid unnecessary reweighs. Also, reassess the practicality of the concept of unaccompanied baggage for domestic relocations.

RESPONSE: The PTOPS system was missing a data table that provides the weight entitlement for UB shipments. This problem has been corrected and should not be a problem in the future.

ITEM: 25

SUBJECT: PTOPS

ISSUE: Maintaining information on a shipment by shipment basis in PTOPS is growing more cumbersome as the volume grows for a contractor.

CONTRACTOR

RECOMMENDATION: Provide a method to speed up information maintenance in PTOPS.

RESPONSE: The PWS requires that information be reported on a shipment by shipment basis. The PTOPS developers will research options for redesign, which could lower the number of keystrokes and/or communication links with the PTOPS server.

Questions/Comments:

Q. Would it be possible to get some kind of data bridge between PTOPS and the contractor?

A. This is on our list of enhancements for PTOPS, but our funds are limited since this is a pilot and we don't know yet what the future "DOD" program will be.

Comment from Industry: It's not the number of data elements that is the issue, but the "time" it takes for the data entry.

BCCA ISSUES

ITEM: 26

SUBJECT: Relocating member's contact telephone numbers at destination.

ISSUE: Contractors are concerned that the Billing and Customer/Contract Auditor (Parsifal Corporation) is insistent that they provide contact information in PTOPS. The relocating members' telephone numbers at destination may be temporary and the carriers feel that the contact information is not their concern.

RESPONSE: There are several reasons why accurate contact information is essential to the pilot program:

The Billing and Customer/Contract Auditor (BCCA) is reliant upon this information residing in PTOPS in order to conduct the prepayment audit and customer satisfaction surveys.

Through the prepayment audit process, it is essential that verification of services be accomplished. In addition, verification of receipt of services is necessary in order to establish a receiving report, which is required by financial rules for payment.

The contact information provides a more efficient means for the government to conduct the customer satisfaction survey. With timely and accurate performance data, the government is able to utilize best value criteria, and award traffic to those contractors providing quality service.

All contractors were instructed to enter the member's contact information in PTOPS. This was part of the contractor training and was reiterated again on the MTMC WEB--published 8 April 1999.

It is our expectation that all contractors have an established quality assurance program and through that program, there will exist accurate contact information, of which can be shared with the government.

ITEM: 27

SUBJECT: Verification of Needed Services.

ISSUE: Use of DD-619's signed by the member to verify needed services.

RESPONSE: DD Forms 619's and 619-1's are not applicable in the pilot program. These forms are used in the current program. Please reference your contract, FAR Clause 52.214(g), Invoice. This clause contains invoicing instructions along with a list of supporting documentation needed to support the invoice.

ITEM: 28

SUBJECT: Third Party Auditor.

ISSUE: Contractors are finding invoiced charges reduced by the third party auditor and would like clearer explanation for the reductions/overcharge findings.

RESPONSE: We have reviewed the procedures established by the third party auditor (BCCA) and find that they are in compliance with their performance work statement. The BCCA is required to provide written explanation of any identified overcharges/inappropriate charges. This explanation is provided to contractors in the form of a "Statement of Difference (SOD)", and identifies the reason for the difference in charges along with the procedures to follow should the contractor disagree with the auditor's findings. If your billing clerk does not receive a SOD when charges have been reduced/denied you should contact Ms. Dinah Locklear, HQMTMC, at 703-681-6426/6427.

ITEM: 29

SUBJECT: Services Actually Performed.

ISSUE: The requirement that all services actually performed must be annotated on the task order is a change from the original purpose of the task order, which was a billing document.

RESPONSE: Please see contract clause 52.212-4(g), Invoice. This clause spells out the invoicing procedures and identifies the task order as supporting documentation, whereby you must submit the "original and one copy of the task order containing member/order officer signature verifying that services were order and delivered". So as to further clarify that services must be identified as having been actually performed, invoicing procedures were published on the MTMC WEB, instructing contractors to identify on the task order the actual

services/number of units performed. Though some services may be covered under another contract line item as an “all inclusive charge”, it is important for purposes of the pilot, to capture all services actually performed. This will allow the government to more accurately measure various aspects of the pilot program, such as single factor rate charges vice separately priced items. To help alleviate any possible confusion, PTOPS has been designed to identify those items that include more than one service. It is the contractors’ responsibility to assure that services are invoiced in compliance those terms set forth in the contract, e.g., three long carries are performed, two are inclusive in the origin and destination service fee, therefore the invoice should reflect a charge for one long carry.

ITEM: 30

SUBJECT: Billing and Customer/Contract Auditor (BCCA).

ISSUE: The BCCA: Parsifal Corporation is requested to attend the quarterly reengineering meeting to discuss invoicing and documentation procedures.

RESPONSE: Parsifal Corporation was awarded the BCCA contract to receive all invoices for the pilot program and to conduct a prepayment audit of the invoiced charges. These requirements are specifically identified in the BCCA contract to include assurance that all invoiced charges and true, correct and in compliance with the pilot contracts. The BCCA’s performance requirements are those of the government and not those of Parsifal Corporation. Further, because the responsibilities of the BCCA are directly associated with payments made by the government, it is important that there be a clear separation of the functions and responsibilities of the service providers (transportation contractors) and the billing office (BCCA). Parsifal Corporation is required to follow those procedures identified by the government to include invoicing procedures. Therefore, any questions concerning invoicing procedures should be directed to Ms. Dinah Locklear, HQMTMC, at 703-681-6426. Also, it is recommended that you review FAR clause 52-212-4(g), Invoice, where specific instructions for invoicing procedures are found.

ATTACHMENT B SENSING BREAKOUTS

GROUP I (PHYLLIS BROZ)

WHAT CONTRACTORS LIKE IN THE PILOT PROGRAM:

1. DIRECT COMMUNICATION WITH THE SERVICE MEMBER THROUGHOUT THE PROCESS; THEY BECOME MORE OF A FRIEND WITH THE SHIPPERS.
2. DIRECT CLAIMS SETTLEMENT TO INCLUDE THE USE OF ON THE SPOT SETTLEMENTS.
3. SPREAD DATES.
4. DIRECT BOOKING WITH THE CONTRACTOR (NO LOI'S AND CONTRACTOR CAN MONITOR THE QUALITY OF HIS AGENTS).
5. NEW OPPORTUNITY TO TRY DIFFERENT COMPENSATION ELEMENTS WITH AGENTS, I.E. INCENTIVE BASED PRICING.
6. USE OF COMMERCIAL TARIFF.
7. ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION (PTOPS) CAUSED AN EXERCISE IN THINKING THROUGH THE BUSINESS PROCESSES INVOLVING IN MOVING.
8. USE OF SOME ASPECTS OF THE PILOT IN THEIR CORPORATE MOVES, I.E. PREAUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL SERVICES, COUNSELING CUSTOMERS ON LIABILITY AND PREPARING FOR THE MOVE, INTRANSIT VISIBILITY).

WHAT CONTRACTORS DON'T LIKE IN THE PILOT PROGRAM:

1. FAR COMMUNICATION PROCESS – TOO MANY LEVELS, TOO MUCH OF “PUT IT IN WRITING”, TOO MANY CUSTOMERS.
2. PROBLEMS WITH PPSO PERSONNEL – NEED MORE TRAINING (MOSTLY DESTINATION), INCONSISTENT GUIDANCE, PUTTING CONTRACTORS AT RISK OF VIOLATIONS BY NOT PERFORMING PPSO ACTIONS IN A TIMELY MANNER.
3. CDC NEEDS TO BE TIED TO AN ADVANCED BOOKING DATE, I.E. 5 DAYS.
4. TOO MANY TESTS GOING ON – THIS IS AN ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN ON THE CONTRACTORS.
5. TIME CONSTRAINTS SET UP IN PTOPS.
6. LACK OF “SPECIFIC” PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK.
7. ONLY “PARTIAL” COMMERCIAL PROCESSES.
8. TOO MUCH PAPERWORK IN BILLING PROCESS – SEEMS A STEP BACK FROM EDI.
9. MISTRUST STILL EXISTS – A “WE/THEY” ATTITUDE, NOT THE PARTNERSHIP WE NEED TO MAKE THE PILOT WORK

GROUP II (CULLEN HUTCHINSON)

EFFICIENCY – GOOD:

1. LESS FORMS
2. DIRECT CUSTOMER COMMUNICATION
3. ITEM 173 IN MILITARY TARIFF

EFFICIENCY – BAD:

1. EXCESS PAPERWORK FOR BILLING
2. INABILITY TO GET A DEFINITIVE ANSWER FROM PPSO

WORKLOAD – GOOD:

1. NO TQAP.
2. DIRECT CLAIMS.
3. NO LOI'S
4. NO CLEARING SIT SHIPMENTS
5. FLEXIBILITY TO USE NON-MILITARY APPROVED WAREHOUSES/CARRIERS
6. COMMERCIAL TARIFF

WORKLOAD – BAD:

1. DOUBLE DATA ENTRY (PTOPS AND CONTRACTOR SYSTEM).
2. BCCA PROCESS CUMBERSOME AND COSTLY.
3. INCORRECT INPUT OF DATA BY PPSO.
4. LACK OF SERVICE MEMBER TELEPHONE NUMBER.
5. WAITING TOO LONG FOR ASSIGNMENT OF ASAN NUMBERS.
6. INABILITY TO REQUEST ADDITIONAL SERVICES AFTER PRE-MOVE SURVEY.
7. NEED MORE TIME TO ENTER DATA ON INTERNATIONAL SHIPMENTS.
8. PPSO NOT FAMILIAR WITH PILOT.
9. UNWILLINGNESS OF PPSO'S TO WORK WITH THE CONTRACTORS
10. NEED A METHOD FOR CHECKING IF WE HAVE A SHIPMENT

CORPORATE BUSINESS PRACTICE – GOOD:

1. SPREAD DATES.
2. WAITING TIME.
3. DIRECT CLAIMS SETTLEMENT.
4. USE OF COMMERCIAL FORMS.
5. CUSTOMER SURVEYS.
6. COMMERCIAL TARIFF.
7. DIRECT CONTACT WITH SERVICE MEMBER.

CORPORATE BUSINESS PRACTICE – BAD:

1. MILITARY APPENDIX TO TARIFF
2. INABILITY TO REFUSE SHORT NOTICE SHIPMENTS.
3. 500 LB MINIMUM.
4. TIME RESTRAINTS FOR DATA REPORTING.
5. FROZEN RATES/FREE SERVICES.
6. HIGHER LEVEL OF REPORTING.

PTOPS – GOOD:

1. MAKES REPORTING EASIER.
2. USER FRIENDLY.
3. CUTS DOWN ON PHONE TIME.
4. CAPTURES ALOT OF DATA.
5. MORE SHIPMENT DETAIL.

PTOPS – BAD:

1. PPSO TRAINING NOT ADEQUATE.
2. SLOWNESS OF THE SYSTEM.
3. SOME INFLEXIBILITY IN THE SYSTEM.
4. NO PROMPTING WHEN THE CONTRACTOR NEEDS TO DO SOMETHING.
5. LACK OF VIOLATION VISIBILITY.
6. NO AD HOC QUERY CAPABILITY.

OTHER – GOOD:

1. SERVICE MEMBERS ARE EXCITED ABOUT THE PILOT.
2. PILOT IS EXPANDABLE BEYOND THE TEST AREAS.
3. PILOT SHOULD CONTINUE.
4. IT'S VIABLE.
5. WITH MORE EXPERIENCE, THE PILOT WILL GET BETTER.

OTHER – BAD:

1. IT COULD BE BETTER.
2. THERE IS RESISTANCE BY THE PPSO'S, I.E. LACK OF TRAINING, CHANGE, CONCERN FOR JOB SECURITY.

ATTACHMENT C
CLOSING SUMMARY (PHYLLIS BROZ)

1. CONTRACTORS WANT SHIPMENT VOLUME INFORMATION PUT ON THE WEB.
2. CONTRACTORS NEED VISIBILITY ON PERFORMANCE INFORMATION.
3. LOOK AT DISTRIBUTION OF TRAFFIC TO SMALL BUSINESS.
4. CONTRACTORS NEED VISIBILITY ON CONTRACT VIOLATIONS.
5. PUT PPSO ADVISORY MESSAGES ON THE WEB.
6. CONTRACTORS NEED TO INFORM US IF THEY FEEL THAT THE AUDITOR IS ASKING FOR UNNECESSARY INFORMATION.
7. HOW LARGE AN ISSUE IS THE TWO-HOUR RESPONSE TIME?
8. NEED COMMENT AREA FOR CONTRACTORS IN PTOPS.
9. NEED MORE DESTINATION TRAINING.
10. PUT LIST OF COR'S ON THE WEB.